UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,356	05/25/2006	Erwin Embrechts	S1225.0001	2514
32172 DICKSTEIN SI	7590 12/13/201 HAPIRO LLP	EXAMINER		
1633 Broadway NEW YORK, N	7	CLAYTOR, DEIRDRE RENEE		
NEW TORK, I	N1 10019		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/13/2010	PAPER
			12/13/2010	1 / 11 1/10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/566,356	EMBRECHTS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Renee Claytor	1627		

	Renee Claytor	1627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 November 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abandonme t, or other evidence, which pl with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a F	aces the Request
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE r).	g date of the final rejection. FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WI	THIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origithan three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate externally set in the final Office action	nsion fee ; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appear	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered because	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	ΓE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying the issu	es for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	ion coponaling mamber of imality reju	otou olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-3	324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	•
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an explanat	ion of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to pro	
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but see Continuation sheet.		condition for allowance beca	ause:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/SREENI PADMANABHAN/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1627			

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

Applicants present arguments over the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection. In particular, Applicants argue that a co-crystal is well known in the pharmaceutical field and one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately know that co-crystals of florfenicol are crystals containing both florfenicol and non-active compounds.

While it is understood what the term "co-crystal" means, it is pointed out that there is no teaching of what co-crystals of florfenicol are. The specification does not teach what co-crystals of florfenicol are or how one would obtain them.

Applicants argue over the 35 USC 103 rejection over Nagabhushan in view of Kruse. In particular Applicants argue that the aqueous compositions taught by Nagabhushan all contain organic solvents. However, as discussed in the final rejection, every embodiment need not be exemplified. Nagabhushan teaches that florfenicol is reacted with dialkylamine sulfur trifluoride in an inert organic solvent and goes on to define an inert organic solvent as any organic or inorganic solvent in which the florfenicol is mised in (Col. 7, lines 27-67 - Col. 8, lines 1-5). Therefore, Nagabhushan does not limit the solvent to an organic solvent.